



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—VERBALS IN -τος IN SOPHOCLES.

INTRODUCTION.¹

Comparative philology shows that one of the oldest suffixes used by our Indo-European family of languages was *-to* or *-ta*. This ending could be either primary or secondary. As a primary ending it was very commonly used in forming participles and the like from verbs. In Sanskrit we find the ending *-ta* side by side with *-na*, forming the so-called 'perfect passive participle'; similarly in Latin the ending *-tus* is used. In Greek these forms are no longer participles, but—a fact which makes their nature more complicated and hence more interesting—'verbal adjectives,' in some of which we see the participial nature still asserting itself through the *time-force* of the verbal; in others the verb-nature has so far died out that the verbal is quite timeless. It is just this time-force of the verbals which will form the basis of the three classes into which we shall divide the examples to be cited, viz. 1st. those referring to *past time* (prior act), 2d. those referring to *present time* (contemporaneous act), 3d. those referring to *future time* (subsequent act). Not alone the *tense*, but also the *voice*, and even the *mood*, of the verb we shall see to be reflected in the verbal. It is established that the *passive*, *neuter* and *middle* voices are seen in these verbals. As to the *active* (i. e. *transitive*) voice we shall attempt to speak more fully below: suffice it to say that this use is foreign to the language of Aischylos. The neuter force of the verbal arises either out of the neuter or the middle voice of the verb from which the verbal is derived. As to the mood, the verbal is quite parallel with the verb, exhibiting forms stating a *fact* (cf. the indicative), as well as those expressing a mere *possibility or wish* (cf. optative and subjunctive). It is the verbals in *τέος* which denote what ought to or should take place (cf. impera-

¹ The following notes on the Sophoclean use of the *adiectiva verbalia* constitute a second paper on the subject of the use of the Verbals in the Tragedians: the first was entitled "De Adiectivorum Verbalium -τος terminatione insignium usu Aeschyleo," diss. inaug. Leipzig, 1889. This second introduction, though not radically different from that on pp. 1-3 of the first paper, is here inserted for patent reasons.

tive). There are something over 400 different formations in Sophocles, ending in *-τος*, which are, with more or less probability, derived by different authorities from verbs: less than a hundred of these are *simplicia*, the rest being *syntheta* and *parasyntheta*. These Sophocles has used in the *passive* sense something less than 220 times, *modal* about 150 times, *neuter* 60 times; *active-transitive*, more or less seriously doubtful, are some seven cases; inexplicable fragments number about 18, composita possessiva 23, nomina 24, of doubtful etymology 24, and textually uncertain 15, 'instrumentalia' 51. These approximately accurate statistics are given for what they are worth. Verbal adjectives can be used either *attributively* or *predicatively* (but cf. Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik*, II, p. 214). Although both the merely passive and the modal significations are quite old—both being seen in Homer, and indeed some even doubt which is the original force of the verbal: in Plato the greater number of these verbals shows the *modal* force—yet other circumstances go to show that the passive force was, on the whole, the commoner, not only in Sophocles, but also, e. g., in Aischylos; and in Attic inscriptions verbalia in *-τος* never have the modal force, which is in the Homeric language much rarer than the merely passive. As to the form of these adjectives: like other adjectives, they can appear in the comparative and superlative degrees; cf. *καταπαρότατον*, O. R. 1344. Three interesting questions concerning the form of the verbals present themselves here: 1st. From what part of the verb are these verbals formed? 2d. What laws govern their accentuation? 3d. What of their *motio*? We shall not pretend to make a special investigation into each of these points, not a one of which has yet been satisfactorily discussed. Concerning the etymological formation of these adjectives, cf. Gross, *Specimen disputationis de adiectivis verbalibus in -τος et -τέος exeuntibus*, Marienwerder, 1839, p. 2 ff., and H. Moissiszig, *Quaestiones de adiectivis graecis, quae dicuntur, verbalibus*, part 1, Conitz, 1844, p. 5 ff. Gross shows that by far the majority of the verbals in *-τος* and *-τέος* is derived from the stem of the verb as seen in the *perfect passive*. The *second perfect* is taken as the basis in *αὐτόματος*: not a few follow the *second aorist* (active or middle), e. g. *ἄσπετος*, *νέορτος*, *ἀνόνητος* κ. τ. λ. Only one example is quoted, *τραπητέον*, which assumes the aor. II pass. as its stem: *ἄπριος* carries us back to the first aorist middle, and *ἀλάμετος*, *ἀμάχετος*, *δυνατός* and many others are formed on the present stem.

Not a few forms follow the analogy of a perfect stem which *does not exist*, but *could exist*, e. g. *θνητός*. Ἀμφίθρεπτος, ἄπαντος, αἰμνηστος, εὐμνηστος, χρηστός, ἄπλαστος, διαιρετός, ἐξαιρετός and many others are referred to the stem as seen in the *I aor. pass.* The *future stem* is seen in *οιστός* and *οιστέος* and others. From page 7 on Gross discusses those many adjectives “quae quum vel ipsa supposita tempora nullam usu frequentatorum temporum habeant rationem, omnes leges despernere videntur.” It has *not* been proved that the *meaning* of the adjective has been influenced by the particular tense-stem from which the verbal has been derived, hence this question does not strictly pertain to the subject under discussion. As, however, Greek grammars are so very misleading—or else silent—on this point, it should be alluded to in passing. More vital for us is the second question—concerning the *accentuation* of the forms—with which also the third is connected. Grammarians (cf. e. g. Lobeck, *Paralipomena grammaticae graecae*, pp. 455–98; Moissiszig, l. l., I, p. 13 ff.) tell us that, as a rule, these adjectives, when *simplicia*, are oxytoned and have three endings (*σεπτός*, *σεπτή*, *σεπτόν*); when, however, *composita* they have the recessive accent, and only two endings (*χαλκήλατος*, *χαλκήλατον*). But as to the derivatives Chandler is quite in despair: “In fact, however” (he says, *Greek Accentuation*², §529), “these words are in such a state of confusion, that no rule can be depended on, and all must be left to observation,” and after citing numerous Greek authorities, he cites Lobeck, l. l., and closes thus (§530): “His (Lobeck’s) researches prove that these words have been brought into such incredible confusion that it would be quite useless to attempt the construction of a more precise rule than that given above.” “It is clear,” he says, §427, “that scribes did not know how to write many of these verbals.” We shall not even tabulate Sophocles’ use of the verbals, in respect to their accentuation and motion. Suffice it to say that in Sophocles, as in Aischylos, the rule of accentuation is quite rigidly observed, that of the *motio* less strictly. But we must not accept a very widespread theory, which invites our belief all the more from being supported by such names as Lobeck (cf. *Paralipomena*, p. 478) and Gottfried Hermann. We refer to the ‘law’ that parasynteta are *oxytoned* when modal, but show the *recessive accent* when merely passive; e. g. *διαλυτός* = modal : *διάλυτος* = passive. Now, this rule is not observed with any degree of strictness in the older language (cf. George Curtius, *Das Verbum*², II, p. 389), and

while many adjectives seem to conform to it, yet the rule, as a rule, has been given up long since: "and this rule," says Chandler, l. 1., §531, note 2, "holds of very many words, but the exceptions and variations are countless and bewildering." We should rather derive διαλυτός from διαλύω, it being accented as a simplex, but διάλυτος from διά + λυτός. The following *passive* parasyntetha are oxytoned in Sophocles: ἀπωστός (Ai. 1019), ἐμπολητός (Phil. 417), ἐπακτόν (Ai. 1296, Tr. 259), προσφθεγκτός (Ph. 1067), ἀνασπαστός (Ant. 1186), διαιρετόν (Trach. 163), ἐπακτός (O. C. 1525, Tr. 491). *Modal parasyntetha not oxytoned* are ἀπόπτυστος (O. C. 1383), ἔμπληκτος (Ai. 1358), ἀπόμοτον (Ant. 388), ἐξάγιστα (O. C. 1526). Cf. Westphal, Method. Gramm. der gr. Sprache, I¹, p. 169 ff. Another 'crux' in the formation of these verbals is the much-talked-of *sigma*, which often appears thrust in between the stem of the verb and the ending -τος; cf. Wex, ad Ant. 29; Reisig, O. C. 1564; Lobeck, Ai. 704; Jebb, Appendix to O. R., p. 225; Curtius, Das Verbum², II, p. 389 ff.; M. I., p. 9. Both the Sanskrit and the Latin participles show not infrequently a 'connecting vowel' *i* before the ending: in Greek, instead of this connecting vowel, the consonant *σ* is often seen between stem and ending. Gottfried Hermann suggested the rule that those forms without the *σ* were merely passive, while those with the *σ* were modal. But even Hermann's statements of this rule are contradictory, or at least inaccurate, for he says (O. R. 362) "*γνωτός enim notum, γνωστός eum, qui potest nosci* significat," while in the note to O. C. 1362 we read "*κλαυτός proprie est defletus, deinde autem ad exemplum aliorum verbalium, lacrimabilis; κλαυστός autem lacrimandus, i. e. quem convenit defleri*"! It was of this rule that Moisisstzig exclaimed (I, p. 9) "Sententia duobus vel tribus exemplis faulta, sexcentis refutatur, et vir summus ipse (= Hermann) in verba sua leviter fortasse effusa profecto non iuraret." Eustathius repeatedly states that there is no difference in meaning between γνωστόν and γνωτόν, ἄγνωστον and ἄγνωτον, save perhaps that the forms with *σ* are the later of the two; cf. pp. 687, 30 f.; 400, 24 f.; 1450, 62 f.; 384, 4 f. Cf. Suidas s. v. σέσωται: σέσωται καὶ σεσωμένος οἱ παλαιοὶ ἄνευ τοῦ σ. καὶ διεξωμένοι φησὶ Θουκυδίδης· οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι σέσωσμαι, ἐπ' ἐνίων δ' ἀπλῶς παραλείπουσι τὸ σ, κεκλειμένον, πεπρημένον. Cf. Walz, Rhet. Graec. IV, pp. 2-3. The readings of the manuscripts are little to be trusted, being themselves contradictory and unreliable; cf. Wex, Antig. 29, where, by a single example, we see how hopelessly confusing the

MS authorities are: similarly Reisig, O. C. 1564. That the metre influences the poet in the choice or rejection of the sigmatic form in not a few instances is not to be denied, as e. g. in the case of a penultimate short vowel: if, however, the penult is long, the σ , of course, does not affect the metrical length of the syllable; and even in such cases the usage appears to be entirely arbitrary. After reading Lobeck's note of over nine pages to Ajax, v. 704, one feels that it is utter folly to attempt anything more than a rehearsal of the numberless difficulties which even a Lobeck met in discussing so hopelessly complicated a question. He has shown that many cases are simply inexplicable, while others owe their σ to the presence of this consonant in the perfect or aorist passive: where the perfect or aorist forms are themselves variable—appearing now with, now without the σ —a corresponding variability is to be expected in the verbalia. He even extends the examination of this sigma to the *nouns* formed from these verbs, and finds in them also a similar confusion. From Lobeck's huge mass of examples, taken at random from writers in prose and poetry of nearly every period of the language, we turn, lastly, to the very different, but hardly less complicated, attempt at a solution of the problem as given by George Curtius, *Das Verbum*², II, p. 394 ff. He argues that in not a few cases—he enumerates fourteen roots—the seemingly inexplicable sigma is nothing but the just representative of a once present final sibilant of the root: this sigmatic final then disappeared in the Greek verb, although comparative philology shows that it belonged to the root, and it now reappears in the verbal: thus are explained e. g. *ἄγευστος* (St. *γευς* : Skt. *ḡush*), *ἐρυστός* (St. *ῥεψς* for *ῥεψ*, Lat. vers : verrere), *ἄτρεστος* ($\sqrt{\text{τρης}}$, Skt. *tras*), *χριστός*, and others. Similarly, roots with original final dental are to be explained, e. g. Plato's *ἀνάδαστος* ($\sqrt{\text{δαρ}}$). Derivative verbs are more complicated, but *ἀκεστός* (*ἀνήκεστος*) seems to go back to an original *ἀκεσθόμαι*: so *ἀτέλεστος*. But, after all, the greater number of these inexplicable forms finds its explanation "in dem ausgedehnten Austausch zwischen den Verben, welche durch Ausstossung des ursprünglich-vorhandenen *j* vor dem thematischen Vocal einen vocalischen Stamm zeigen, und denen, in welchen sich vor jenem *j* ein δ entwickelt hat, das mit diesem zu ζ wird." Already in Homer there are ten cases of verbs in $\alpha\omega$ which exhibit parallel forms in $\alpha\zeta\omega$: similarly, some verbs in $\epsilon\omega$ show secondary forms in $\iota\zeta\omega$, and possibly some in $\nu\omega$ have forms from those in $\nu\zeta\omega$. Thus $\alpha\zeta\omega$ may, through $\alpha\omega$, go

back to **ajō*, similarly *εζω* or *ιζω* to **εjō*, and *υζω* to **υjō*. Such verbs are e. g. *ἄγαμαι*, *δαμάω*, *αἰνέω*: *σώζω* seems to be very complicated, because its forms have become tangled up with those of a verb *σάω*: Homer does not show the questionable *σ* in this verb at all, and only once the *ζ* (*σώζων*), where *σάων* is to be written. This *ζ* arose from *j* especially after the vowel *υ* and the diphthongs *av*, *ευ*, *ου*: so e. g. *καυστός* and *κλαυστός*: *γνωστός* may possibly carry us back to **γνωjō*. Curtius closes this chapter with a word of warning against the temptation to be too exact in accepting or rejecting certain of these forms: the tradition of the MSS is often worse than a poor guide, the sigma became more and more popular with time, and the author doubted if more than such beginnings of explanations would ever be made, with any degree of certainty. "Yet I would suggest," observes Jebb, p. 225 of the Appendix to his edition of *Oedipus rex*, "on the other hand, that the special attribution of a potential sense to the sigmatic forms may have thus much ground. When two forms, such as *γνωτός* and *γνωστός* were both current, regular analogies would quicken the sense that *γνωτός* had a participial nature, while *γνωστός*, in which the *σ* obscured the analogy, would be felt more as an ordinary adjective, and would therefore be used with less strict regard to the primary participial force. Thus it might be ordinarily *preferred* to *γνωτός*, when 'knowable' was to be expressed. At the same time, it would always remain an available synonym for *γνωτός* as = 'known'."

Those verbals which exhibit the simple passive signification—without the modal coloring—will be taken up first. While, naturally, most of these verbals are derived from active verbs, yet some are derived from media, e. g. *κρεμαστός*, *λωβητός*, etc. First we shall enumerate those verbals in which the *act* of the verb is prior to the resulting condition as expressed by the verbal itself: such cases, then, contain the idea of relatively past action. It is, however, not infrequently hard to see if the composita with *α* privativum really do refer to a past act, the negative resulting condition oftentimes being separated by so exceedingly narrow a space of time from the (negative) act, which could in many cases be said rather to accompany than to precede the condition as represented in the verbal. And yet such cases have been referred to past rather than to present acts. Again, it would have been tedious and very unsatisfactory, had the attempt been made to classify

strictly all cases in which the adjective was, or seemed to be, used *proleptically*; and yet this is not unimportant, as the modality may have arisen out of a sort of prolepsis. The individual examples are divided into those in which the adjective is associated (α) with a *person*, (β) with a *thing*: animals have been regarded as things. It has not been proved that the metre has in any way influenced the poet in the use of these verbalia in -τος; we shall see, however, that the case is different with those in -τέος. The following list of dissertations and programs is here appended: Dr. Henricus Moisisstzig, *Quaestiones de adiectivis graecis, quae dicuntur, verbalibus*: the *first part* (Conitz, 1844) contains a general introduction into the subject; a *second part* (Conitz, 1853) treats of the Platonic use of these adjectives; the *third part* (1861) treats of Demosthenes' use of the verbals: there are still other numbers of these programs, but they are obtained not without the greatest difficulty. Gross has two programs: *Specimen disputationis de adiectivis verbalibus in -τος et -τέος exeuntibus*, Marienwerder, 1839, and *Disputationis de adiectivis verbalibus in -τος et -τέος exeuntibus specimen alterum*, Marienwerder, 1847. Other monographs bearing more or less directly on the subject are: Joannes Schmidt, *De epithetis compositis in tragoedia Graeca usurpatis*, Berlin, 1865; Kopetsch, *De verbalibus in -τος et -τέος Platonicis, dissertatio, cui intextae sunt breves de Homericis adnotationes*, Lyck, 1860; Wilh. Holtze, *Adversaria semasiologiae apud poetas graecos usque ad Euripidem*, Naumburg a. S., 1866; Carolus Schambach, *Sophocles qua ratione vocabulorum significationes mutet atque variet*, in two parts, the first a dissertation (Göttingen, 1867), the latter a program (Nordhausen, 1878); Arnold Juris, *De Sophoclis vocibus singularibus*, Halle a. S., 1876; Friedrich Slameczka, *Über Eigenthümlichkeiten im Gebrauche der Epitheta bei Sophokles*, program, Teschen, 1869; Carolus Schindler, *De Sophocle verborum inventore*, Breslau, 1877. Other monographs will be mentioned on occasion. The verses are quoted according to Dindorf-Merkel, whose text is taken as the basis: the fragments are quoted from the first edition of Nauck's *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*: the scholiast is cited according to the edition of Papageorg, Teubner, 1888. Whenever our reading differs materially from that of the Laurentianus, this is indicated.

VOICE, PASSIVE: TIME, RELATIVELY PAST.

a) *With Persons.*

O. C. 973 ἀγέννητος τότ' ἦ. Trach. 61 καὶ ἀγεννήτων. Trach. 1083 ἀγύμναστον μ'. Schol. ὁδύνης ἀπείραστον, ἄνετον ὁδυνῶν. On Hesychius' definition, πολυγυμνάστοις, cf. Clemm, "de alpha intensivo," p. 71, 11. O. C. 1120 ἄελπτα (τέκνα). We follow Hermann, "Sunt qui hos putent accusativos esse absolutos, et ἄελπτα pro adverbio positum. Quorum nihil opus." Schol. οὐ γὰρ φησιν ἀέλπτως φανέντων ἐμοὶ τῶν τέκνων μηκύνω τὸν λόγον, ἀλλὰ <τὰ> τέκνα φανέντα εἶτα μηκύνω τὸν λόγον. Hesychius and Cyrillus define the verbal by the 'more Attic' (Rutherford, New Phrynichus, p. 26) ἀπροσδόκητον. Ai. 1177 ἄθαπτος ἐκπέσοι. Ai. 1307 ἀθάπτους (οὓς). Ai. 1333 ἄθαπτον (ἄνδρα). Ant. 205-6 ἄθαπτον . . . καὶ πρὸς κυνῶν ἐδεστον (τοῦτον). Ant. 697 ἄθαπτον (αὐτάδελφον). Phil. 351 ἄθαπτον. With Hermann, we do not join these words with the following οὐ γὰρ εἰδόμην. "Itaque," says he, "necessario hoc dicere putandus est Neoptolemus, se, quoniam nunquam vidisset patrem suum, nunc saltem, priusquam sepulcro corpus traderetur, videre eum cupivisse." O. C. 1521 ἄθικτος ἡγητήρος (of the speaker himself). We consider the verbal passive, as against those (e. g. Holtze, p. 6: "proprie; non tangens ducem, quod interpretes omnes (?) passive videntur acceperisse (intactus a duce)"), who ascribe to it an active force, which ἄθικτος does not have before Callimachus. Trach. 417 αἰχμάλωτον (τὴν). Trach. 532 αἰχμάλωτοις παισίν. Ai. 1284 κακέλευστος ἦλθ' ἐναντίος. Tr. 45 ἀκήρυκτος μένει. Schol. ἄσημος, οὐ μηνυόμενος ὅπου ποτ' ἐστίν· ὃν οὐδεὶς ἐλθὼν κηρύττει καὶ ἀπαγγέλλει ποῦ πότ' ἐστίν. Ant. 1027 ἀκίνητος πέλῃ. ἀκίνητος 1: ἀκείται L, which also gives the variant αἶνητος. Schol. ἀμετάθετος. Ant. 29 ἄκλαυτον. ἄταφον ἄκλαντον, L: ἄκλαντον ἄταφον, γ. The Πολυνεῖκος νέκυν of vs. 26 is here not to be regarded as a thing. Ant. 847 ἄκλαυτος . . . ἔρχομαι. V. L. ἄκλαυστος. Ant. 876 ἄκλαυτος . . . ἔρχομαι. V. L. ἄκλαυστος. Other words in the verse are suspected by Hermann. Ai. 289 ἄκλητος οὐθ' . . . κληθεῖς. Some, finding ἄκλητος οὐθ' . . . κληθεῖς tautological, suspect the reading. With Hermann Schütz (Sophokleische Studien, p. 25), we think that, if anything is to be changed, it should be κληθεῖς, not ἄκλητος. Trach. 39 ἀνάστατοι (ἡμεῖς). We derive the verbal from the causal force of ἀνίστημι, surgere facio (Steph.) Hesychius defines it by κατεστραμμένους. Cf. Anec. Bekk., p. 211, 10. O. C. 429 ἀνάστατος . . . ἐπέμφθη. Fg. 736 ἀπαιδεύτων βροτῶν. Phil. 731

καπόπληκτος . . . ἔχει. Antig. 1035 ἄπρακτος (μαντικῆς) εἰμι. "Poeta," says Hermann, "quod proprie diceretur, κοῦδὲ μαντικῇ ἄπρακτος ὕμιν ἐστὶ κατ' ἐμοῦ, invertit, dixitque, et ne a vaticiniis quidem intentatus vobis sum." Him we follow, with Wex, Schambach (II, p. 3), Jebb, Campbell, Holtze (p. 6), Kvičala (Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Sophocles, III, p. 83 sq.) and others. Ai. 1019 ἀπωστος . . . ἀπορριφθήσομαι. Suidas defines the verbal here with ἐκδεδιωγμένος. O. C. 906 ἄτρωτον (τοῦτον). Trach. 392 αὐτόκλητος (ἀνὴρ). Cf. Joh. Schmidt, p. 35, note 15. Ai. 908 ἄφαρκτος φίλων. Schol. ἀφύλακτος, οὐ πεφραγμένος καὶ τετειχισμένος τοῖς φίλοις. On the spelling (ἄφαρκτος vs. ἄπρακτος) cf. Blaydes ad loc. O. C. 1702 ἀφίλητος (οὐδὲ γὰρ ὦν ἀφίλητος). We accept Hermann's γὰρ ὦν for the γέρων of the L. The scholiast's λείπει τὸ ἦς is now senseless. Fg. 262 γνωτός . . . ἀνὴρ. But the verbal may be considered indefinitely present; cf. κλυτός. Ai. 211 δουρίλωτον (σέ, but cf. Schol.). Ai. 894 δουρίληπτον . . . νύμφην. Phil. 417 οὐμπολητός Σισύφον. Ai. 1296 ἐπακτὸν ἀνδρ'. Trach. 259 ἐπακτὸν (στρατὸν). Or is a στρατός a thing? Ai. 1386 οὐπιβρόντητος (στρατηγός). Unless conjectures be resorted to, the passage can be explained only by taking this to be the only passage in extant Greek, in which ἐπιβροντάω is used in the sense of ἐμβροντάω. Clearly the verbal means *attonitus* 'thunderstruck' (as against Campbell's *modal* interpretation of it). So the Schol.: οὐπιβρόντητος] ὃν εἰώθαμεν λέγειν ἐμβρόντητον. Cf. Suidas s. v. Ant. 406 καπίληπτος ἥρῃθι. Ai. 103 τοῦπίτριπτον κίναδος. Thus Ajax alludes to Ulysses. Adjectives which, like this one, have acquired some idiomatic meaning are not infrequently particularly hard to trace back from their present meaning to that from which this meaning has arisen: so here. Suidas defines ἐπίτριπτος by ὁ ἐπιτριβῆναι ἄξιος: Stephanus "contritus. conteri dignus (!)." Campbell, translating 'the accursed fox,' says "The verbal, by a sort of prolepsis (!), expresses what ought to be." Taken passively, the verbal is stronger, because saying more, than when taken modally. Cf. German 'ein geriebener Kerl.' O. C. 389 ζητητὸν (σέ). Ant. 957 κατάφαρκτος ἐν δεσμῷ. On the spelling cf. Jebb, Ant. 241; Wecklein, Curae epigraphicae, p. 44 f. Ant. 309 κρεμαστοὶ . . . δηλώσθη' ὕβριν. We derive the verbal from the transitive meaning of κεράννυμι 'herabhängen lassen' (Pape). Ant. 1221 κρεμαστήν αὐχένος. O. R. 1263 κρεμαστήν τὴν γυναικ'. Trach. 27 κριτὸν (λέχος). O. R. 19 λεκτοὶ (οἱ δ'). Ai. 1388 λωβητὸν αὐτὸν. Phil. 1103 λωβατός (ἐγώ). O. R. 780 πλαστός ὡς εἶην. Schol. προσποιη-

τός, ἀλλότριος, νόθος. Trach. 276 πατόν νυν. Ai. 830 πρόβλητος (ρύφθω). El. 126 πρόδοτον (Ἀγαμέμνονα). El. 1074 πρόδοτος . . . ἠλέκτρα. Phil. 1067 προσφθεγκτός (γενήσομαι). Schol. προσφωνθῆναι ἄξιος. Scarcely any one nowadays considers this verbal modal. Of this and several other adjectives whose accent doubtless misled the ancients, Lobeck says (Paralipp., p. 489): "Si vero de Homero res parum explorata videtur, posteriorum scripta magnam oxytonorum copiam suppeditant, quae a potentiali significatione longe seiuncta sunt." O. C. 1534 σπαρτῶν ἀπ' ἀνδρῶν. Phil. 335 τοξευτός (τέθηκεν). O. R. 1123 ὠνητός (δοῦλος).

β) *With Things.*

Fg. 775 τὰ γένητα (ἅπαντα). τὰ γένη τὸ, Plut. Mor., p. 732 D. τὰ γέννητα, Valck. τὰ γέννητα, Nauck. O. R. 58 γνωτὰ κοῦκ ἄγνωτα. Thus the La. And yet Ritter changes the reading to ἀγνωτα, on the ground that the ancients never used the word ἄγνωτος. But ἄγνωτος is so far from being un-Greek that it is even proved for Sophocles' time. In Pindar, Ol. VI 67, two good MSS give ἄγνωτον, and in the Frogs of Aristophanes, v. 926 of the two traditional readings, ἄγνωτα and ἀγνωτα, the latter has long ago been rejected by Lobeck (Paralipp., p. 274) and Bergk. Ant. 454 ἄγραπτα . . . νόμιμα; Ai. 53-54 σύμμικτά τε . . . ἄδαστα . . . φρονήματα. On the construction and punctuation of the words cf. Lobeck's note ad loc. It seems that Attic inscriptions always write σύμμικτος (Meisterhans, Grammatik der attischen Inschriften², p. 144, Note 1253 δ)). O. C. 249 ἀδόκητον χάριν. Ai. 1166 ἀείμνηστον τάφον. The verbal is used proleptically. Schol. τὸν ἐσόμενον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τάφον ἀείμνηστον. Ai. 715 ἐξ ἀέλπτων Αἴας μεταγενώσθη θυμῶν. Schol. ἐξ ἀνελπίστων καὶ μεγάλων νεικέων. Some join the verbal with θυμῶν. We have hesitatingly taken the expression ἐξ ἀέλπτων adverbially, although Lobeck doubts if, in the earlier period, ἐξ ἀέλπτων is used for the usual ἐξ ἀέλπτου or ἐξ ἀπροσδοκήτου. In either event the verbal is passive. Trach. 203 ἄελπτον ὄμμ'. Ant. 467 ἄθαπτον . . . νέκυν. Trach. 686 φάρμακον . . . ἄθικτον. O. R. 439 αἰνικτὰ (πάντα). Or is the time of the adjective relatively present rather than past? O. R. 384 δωρητόν, οὐκ αἰτητόν (ἦν = ἀρχήν). O. R. 255-6 θεήλατον, ἀκάθαρτον (πρᾶγμα). Schol. ὑπὸ θεῶν ἐλαυνόμενον. O. R. 1427 ἀκάλυπτον (ἄγος). Trach. 875 ἐξ ἀκινήτου ποδός. O. C. 1708 ἄκλυτον (πένθος). Fg. 856 ἄκρατος (ἱμερος). So the MSS: thus taken the verbal is

passive, and the metaphor taken from wine. El. 786 ἄκρατον αἶμα. O. C. 1261 ἀκτένιστος (κόμη). But the time of the verbal may be a general present. Ant. 1071 ἀκτέριστον . . . νέκυν. Ant. 1207 ἀκτέριστον . . . παστάδα. Ant. 1309 ἀμφιθήκτω ξίφει. Trach. 572 ἀμφίθρεπτον αἶμα. Ant. 1186 ἀνασπαστοῦ πύλης. With Wex, Böckh and others, we accept Hermann's explanation of this difficult adjective: "ἀνασπαστοῦ πύλης κλείθρα χαλῶσα dictum usitatissima figura, pro ὥστε ἀνασπαστὸν γενέσθαι . . . Sed vereor ne nihil aliud quam pessuli retractio significetur." Cf. Lobeck, Paralipp., p. 490. Schol. (similarly Triclinius) δυσχερῶς ἀνασπώμενης καὶ ἀνοιγομένης (!). Trach. 240 ἀνάστατον . . . χώραν γυναικῶν. While ἀνάστατος is more properly used of persons, still its use of things is so plainly shown that it is absurd to resort to conjectures, writing e. g. ἀναστάτων to agree with γυναικῶν. Cf. Bekk., Anec. Graec., p. 211: ἀνάστατον τὴν πόλιν ποιήσας: ἀνοικίσας ἢ μεταστήσας ἢ μεταγαγών. Suidas s. v. εἴρηται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ πόλεων ἐαλωκυῶν καὶ οἰκῶν ἐξερημωθέντων τὸ ἀνάστατον. Cf. Soph. Ant. 673: Andocides, κατὰ Ἀλκιβιάδου, 31; Lycophron, Alexandra, vs. 770. Ant. 673 ἀναστάτους οἴκους. Trach. 673 ἀνέλπιστον (θαῦμα). Schol. θαυμαστὸν καὶ οἶον οὐκ ἂν τις ἐλπίξει παθεῖν. Fg. 264 ἀντίπλαστον νόμον. Hesych. ἀντὶ τοῦ ἰσόπλαστον, ὅμοιον. Fg. 375 ἀντίσπαστά τε Λυδῆς ἐφυμνεί πηκτίδος συγχορδία. But the sense of the Fg. is uncertain, and Campbell takes the verbal to be an (adverbial) accusative plural. Ant. 980 ἀνύμφετον γονάν. Triclinius observes: δέον δὲ εἰπεῖν, ἀνυμφέτου μητρός, ἀνύμφετον πρὸς τὸ γονὰν εἶπε. Nearly every one is satisfied with this explanation, and yet Slameczka exclaims (l. l., p. 6): "Jedoch passt dasjenige, was oben als Hermann's Bemerkung über die Enallage angeführt wurde, auf unseren Fall sehr wenig, weil sich bei aller Kühnheit doch nicht annehmen lässt, dass die γονά selbst ἀνύμφετος genannt werden könne. Nauck hält, daher, die Stelle für verderbt" (!). O. C. 19 ἀξέστου πέτρου. Phil. 868 ἄπιστον οἰκούρημα. Immo, says Hermann, ἐλπίδων ἄπιστον est ὑπὸ τῆς ἐμῆς ἐλπίδος ἀπιστηθέν. Phil. 467 ἀπόπτου (ἐξ ἀπόπτου opposed to ἐγγύθεν). Ant. 44 ἀπόρρητον πόλει (θάπτειν σφ'). Schol. τὸν ἀπηγορευμένον καὶ κεκωλυμένον ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως τολμᾶς θάπτειν σὺ; Followed by Wex, who attempts to prove from the following corrupt verses that the verbal refers to σφέ, although ἀπόρρητος seems never to be used with persons. With e. g. Matthiä (Gr. Gr., §564, p. 1112) we take the verbal to be neuter; cf. Hermann's note ad loc. El. 1017 ἀπροσδόκητον οὐδέν. Cf. Dobree, Adversaria critica, I, p. 32. Ant. 972 ἀρατὸν ἔλκος. If this reading be correct, the verbal is passive, though Triclinius'

definition (καταράσιμον) would rather be modal. El. 1012 ἄρρητ' . . . φυλάξομαι. Ellendt's 'nefandus dictu' is certainly not a happy translation of the verbal, which is here merely passive, with prolepsis. Ant. 556 ἀρρήτοις . . . λόγοις. Trach. 687 ἀρτίχριστον (γιν). Schol. παραντὰ χριόμενον. Fg. 791 ἀσπάθητον χλαῖναν. Ἀσπάθητον χλαῖναν: ἀνύφαντον, Anecd. Bekk., p. 453, 18. O. R. 1231 αὐθαίρετοι (αἱ sc. πημονῶν). O. C. 523 αὐθαίρετον οἰδέν. Until some very decidedly preferable reading has been suggested, we follow the tradition, with which most editors now content themselves. "Auch αὐθαίρετον ist zweifellos richtig," says Schütz (boldly), p. 154. Fg. 1022 αὐθαίρετα πάντα. Fg. 308 αὐτοκτίτους δόμους. Bloomfield, however, derives the verbal (Gloss. in Aesch. Prom., vs. 309) not from κτίω, but from *κτίω. Fg. 276 ἀφύλλωτον πέτραν. The context is lost, and the etymology of the adjective—a ἄπ. λεγ.—is uncertain. If, with Passow, we derive it from the doubtful verb φυλλώω ('belauben,' cf. Hippocr. de nat. puer., c. 8), it is passive. Or is it a Bahuvrihi? Stephanus says: "ἀφύλλωτος affertur pro ἄφυλλος. Sonat autem q. d. infoliatius, i. e. non foliatus." Fg. 638 ἀχάλκευτα τρύπανα. O. R. 396 γνωτόν (ἐκ θεῶν του). Trach. 163 διαιρετόν (μοῖραν). MSS and editors vary as to the accentuation of the verbal. There seems, however, to be no certain proof that the form διαιρετος existed at all. El. 344 διδακτά (νουθετήματα). Ant. 346 δικτυοκλώστοις (σπείραισι). Schol. τοῖς σχοινοῖς τοῖς εἰς δίκτυον κεκλωσμένοις ἢ συγκλείουσι τὰ δίκτυα. Ai. 146 δορίληπτος (λεία). Trach. 677 ἐδεστόν ἐξ αὐτοῦ φθίνει. Ai. 1302 ἔκκριτον . . . δώρημα. This δώρημα was, however, a person. Trach. 12 ἐλικτός (δράκων). But this verbal may contain the idea of a universal present; and, again, the δράκων is really a person. O. C. 1671 ἔμφυτον . . . αἷμα. Fg. 293 ἐνήλατα ξύλα. Thus we read, and thus connect the words in this corrupt passage, whose meaning is not made much clearer even by Lobeck's long note to Phrynichus, p. 178. Perhaps the adjective is merely passive: "das Hineingetriebene" (Pape). Rutherford, in the Phrynichus passage, is compelled to leave the question 'unsettled.' O. C. 1525 ἐπακτοῦ (δορός). Trach. 491 ἐπακτόν (νόσον). Ai. 730 ἐρυστὰ . . . ξίφη. Ant. 430 εὐκροτήτου . . . πρόχου. O. C. 1707 εὐσκίαστον (κοίταν). With Passow, we derive this verbal (a ἄπ. λεγ.?) from σκιάω. Fg. 676 ἐξαίρετον . . . ἀκουσίαν. El. 702 ζυγωτῶν ἀρμάτων. Phil. 987 Ἡφαιστότευκτον (σέλας). O. R. 992 θεήλατον μάντευμα. Ant. 278 θεήλατον τοῦργον. Fg. 615 θεηλάτους (νόσους). El. 707 θεοδμήτων (Ἀθηνῶν). O. C. 1472 θέσφατος . . . τελευτή. Schol.

ἡ θεοπισθείσα τελευτή. The verbal remains passive, whether we derive it from ἴφα 'to speak' (with e. g. Vaniček, p. 571; cf. Lobeck, Rhematikon, p. 128, vs. Curtius, Grundzüge⁵, p. 515) or from ἴσφα (cf. Göbel, Lexilogus, I, p. 77). O. C. 969 θέσφατον (τι). Ant. 1286 κακάγγελτα . . . ἄχη. Schol. κακὴν ἀγγελίαν ἔχοντα. "Dolores," explains Iuris, p. 37, "ex malo nuntio excitati. Schol. perperam active: κακὴν . . . ἔχοντα." Slameczka, p. 11, would here—as frequently elsewhere—resolve the adjective into its component parts, κακάγγελτα ἄχη = ἄχη κακῆς ἀγγελίας 'den Jammer einer schlimmen Botschaft.' Better is Schmidt's 'mala calamitose nuntiata' (p. 14). The -αγγελτα is added merely to give the expression that *poetic fullness* so common in the Tragedians, especially in lyric passages. Ant. 1011 καλυπτῆς . . . πιμελῆς. Schol. ἐκ τοῦ λίπους τῆς καλυπτούσης αὐτοῦς πιμελῆς ἐξέπιπτον. Defining it actively, Matthiae (Gram., §220, 2), Brunck ad loc. ("καλυπτῆς, id est τῆς καλυπτούσης . . . activam hic significationem habet"), Hermann, Wex (Ant., v. 392) and others follow the Schol. But these editors were misled by two circumstances: the Scholiast was merely giving the *general sense* of the passage, as he understood it, not parsing the adjective; furthermore, καλύπτειν by no means always signifies 'umhüllen, bedecken,' καλύπτειν τινά; but can (already in Homer) mean 'über einen etwas decken,' καλύπτειν τιμί τι (see examples in Pape, Ebeling, etc.). So here: 'fielen aus dem umgewickelten Fette' (Pape). So Mehlhorn, Anacreontea, p. 240: "Ad hoc genus, in quo perversa activae significationis derivatio interpretes fefellit, pertinet etiam locus in Soph. in Antig. 1010 . . . Aperte hoc non simpliciter est *tegere*, sed *circumvolvere aliquid circa aliquid vel superinducere*." So Böckh (p. 272): "καλυπτῆς ist nicht activisch zu fassen, sondern ist von der *umgehüllten* . . . Umwicklung zu verstehen": similarly Stephanus. Ant. 1253 κατάσχετον (τι). Fg. 10 καταστίκτον κυνός. Fg. 365 κηρόπλαστον ὄργανον. Trach. 245 κριτὸν (κτῆμα). Phil. 1112 κρυπτὰ τ' ἔπη. El. 159 κρυπτὰ τ' ἀχέων ἐν ἡβῃ. Scarcely a word of this passage is free from suspicion. Some want ἐλευθέρα for κρυπτῇ: others cannot imagine how Suidas and the Schol. came to consider ἀχέων a participle: the metre is entirely out of shape. If anything is certain in this confusion, it seems to be that κρυπτῇ is here certainly passive, meaning 'hidden.' With Haupt, Op. II, p. 291, we follow those who join ἀχέων as a genitive with κρυπτῇ. Ant. 1198 κυνοσπάρακτον σῶμα; Ant. 1275 λακπάτητον . . . χαράν. Schol. τὴν μεθ' ὕβρεως ἀπωθοιμένην ἢ τὴν μεγάλως καταπατουμένην.

Variae lectiones *λεωπάτητον, λαξπάτητον, λὰξ πατητὸν*. We follow the Laurentianus and Triclinius. The Schol. further adds *τὴν χαρὰν λὰξ πατήσας*. Hermann saw that the Schol. was trying to explain two readings. Trach. 1261 *λιθοκόλλητον στόμιον πρίουσ'*. Variae lectiones *λυκοκόλλητον, πυκνοκόλλητον, πυρικόλλητον* (cf. Schütz, p. 446), and others. Of this passage—one of the most annoying in Sophocles—the Schol. says: *ἄγε οὖν, φησὶν, ὃ σκληρὰ ψυχῇ, ὡς ἀπὸ χαλυβικοῦ σιδήρου πεποιημένη πρὶν τήνδε ἀνακινήσαι νόσον ἐνδοῦσα τὸ σεαυτῆς στόμα ἐμφραγῆναι ὥσανεὶ στόμα φρέατος λίθω κεκολλημένον πρὸς τὸ μηκέτι ὕδωρ ἀνιμᾶσθαι· λείπει δὲ τὸ ὡς, ὡς ἀπὸ χάλυβος γενομένη· χάλυβος λιθοκόλλητον στόμιον παρέχουσ' λίθινον καὶ σκληρόν χαλινὸν σαντῇ ἐπιβαλοῦσα*. But what does *στόμιον* mean here? 'A bit,' or 'the mouth of a cave'? The Schol. accepts both meanings! If it means 'the mouth of a cave,' the verbal means 'cemented,' and is, hence, passive: or is it a derivative from *λιθοκόλλα* 'cement'? *Στόμιον* means, however, in Sophocles, more frequently 'a bit,' and so we interpret it here. Accepting the *λιθοκόλλητος* of the MSS, we take the verbal to mean 'set with stones'—whether costly ones as ornaments, or sharp ones for cutting more effectually the mouth, does not affect the passiveness of the verbal. Welcker's arguments (Rh. Mus. II 2, 206; 1834) against our rendering of *λιθοκόλλητος* avail nothing, as his results are there all based on the use of the adjective in later authors. Ant. 1204 *λιθόστρωτον* . . . *νυμφεῖον*; Trach. 1069 *λωβητὸν εἶδος*. Nauck, Merkel, Schütz (p. 443) suspect the verse as spurious. Ai. 30 *νεορράντω ξίφει*. Ai. 828 *νεορράντω ξίφει*. Ai. 6 *ἔχνη νεοχάραχθ'*. Schol. *νεωστὶ κεχαράγμένα*. Phil. 715 *οἶνοχύτου πώματος*. The question is, what relations exist between the elements *οἶνος*, *χυτός* and *πῶμα*? The Schol. cuts the knot by explaining *οἶνον περιφραστικῶς*. Schindler (p. 62) argues: "Nec recusant eandem illam per duplex subiectum explicationem frequentissima illa cum *-χυτος, -χοος, -ρυτος* composita, ut Sophoclis (Ph. 715) *οἶνόχυτον πῶμα*, potus vini infusi, vel Euripidea *ιδρόχυτοι κρῆναι* (Cycl. 66), *πῶμα ἰδρηχόον* (fr. Nauck, 884), *ρανίδες αἱματοόρρυτοι* (Iph. Aul. 1515), alia, quae apud omnes poetas passim deprehenduntur similia. In quibus tamen propterea mihi diffido, quod haud scio an intransitivam vim hic—ut saepe alias—contraxerint adiectiva verbalia *-χυτός, -ρύτός, -χοος*, substantiva autem, quibuscum colligata illa sunt, dativo intellegenda sint: vino, aqua, sanguine manans." But *χέεται* does not mean 'to flow.' Slameczka (p. 10)—and similarly Schmidt (p. 20)—explains it as used 'statt *οἶνον χυτοῦ*,' and classes it

along with those cases, 'wo das Epitheton ein Compositum ist, an dessen Stelle wir einen Genitiv mit einem Adjectiv erwarten.' Tessing, however, classes this passage with those sets of determinativa composita, of which he says (p. 67): "Huius generis composita ad nomina sua ita adiunguntur, ut posterior compositi pars significet actionem, cuius subiectum, quod aiunt, prior pars sit. Id autem vocabulum, ad quod refertur compositum, significat, quo tempore vel quo loco vel quo instrumento vel qua causa actio fiet." He argues that Sophocles and Euripides make frequent use of such composita. Thus explained, the expression means 'wine poured out *with a view to, for the purpose of being a* πῶμα.' But we think the οἶνος stands here merely in the relation of an instrumental to χυτός, the expression meaning then 'a drink poured out with wine,' the verbal being passive. Ant. 475 ὁπτὸν (σιδῆρον). Ant. 1301 ὀξύθηκτος οἶδε βωμία πτέρυξ. La. ἡ δ' ὀξύθηκτος ἦδε βωμία πέριξ. Schol. ὀξείαν λαβοῦσα πληγὴν. "Parum constat," observes Schindler, p. 13, "utrum translate dictum Eurydicam denotet ad acrem furorem acutam, an proprie intellegendum sit de telo bene acuto, quo sensu Euripides vocem posuit Andr. 1118, 1150, El. 1159. Aegrotare enim codicum verba invictis argumentis Hermannus et Schneidewinus effecerunt, etsi, quousque corruptela pateat, non satis apparet." Many other conjectures have been suggested: cf. Schütz, p. 253; Wecklein, Ars Sophoclis emendandi, p. 74. We have hesitatingly adopted Hermann's ingenious conjecture, which accords with the Scholiast. Ant. 1316 ὀξυκώκυτον πάθος. With Stephanus ('acuta voce deploratus'), Böckh ('tiefbejammert'), Schindler (p. 13), Juris (p. 38), Tessing (p. 46) and others, we consider the verbal to be merely *passive*. Trach. 661 παγχρίστω (τὰς πειθοῦς). A corrupt passage. Schol. λείπει τὸ πέπλω, συγκεκραμένους καὶ ἄρμους τῇ πειθοὶ τοῦ θηρός. Hermann argues: "Constructio est συγκραθεὶς ἐπὶ προφάσει θηρός, παγχρίστω τὰς πειθοῦς. Conciliatus praedictione Centauri, suada peruncta. Satis moleste haec Sophocles enunciat, novata significatione vocabuli πρόφασις, id ut praedictionem vel mandatum indicaret. Sic certe unus ex scholiastis videtur accepisse, qui caeteroquin inepte scribit (to vs. 660), τῷ πέπλω τῆς πειθοῦς θελχθεὶς, τῷ ἐκ προφάσεως τοῦ Νέσσου κατεσκευασμένῳ." But παγχρίστω may be a noun. O. C. 1381 παλαίφατος Δίκη. O. C. 454 παλαίφαθ' (τὰς ἐμοῦ). Trach. 823 παλαιφάτου προνοίας. Schol. γράφε παλαίφοιβον ἢ τῆς παλαιομαντευσαμένης φοιβᾶσθαι γὰρ τὸ μαντεύεσθαι. "Facilius credas," says Hermann, "qui ita scripserunt, voluisse

tās pálai phoíβou pronoías. Sed librorum scripturam numeri antistrophici tuentur." Ant. 131 παλτῶ . . . πυρὶ. Schol. τῶ κεραυνῶ τῶ ἄνωθεν παλθέντι. Ai. 230 παραπλάκτω χερὶ. Schol. τῇ μανικῇ· παραπλήξ γὰρ ὁ μανικός. Ai. 907 πηκτὸν . . . ἔγχος. Schol. περιπεπηγὸς αὐτῶ. O. R. 1264 πλεκταῖς ἑώρας. Fg. 461 πλεκτοῖς (κημοῖσι). Fg. 490 πλεκταῖς . . . σπείραισι. πλεκταῖς, Nauck; πλεκτοῖς, Valck; πλείστοις, L. Fg. 683 πνικτὰ . . . μέλη (?). O. C. 1592 πολυσχίστων (κελεύθων). πολυσχίστων, Heath; πολυσχίστοις, L. El. 207 πρόδοτον (βίον). Trach. 684 πρόρρητα (τά δ'). Schol. πρὸς ἐμὲ ὑπὸ Νέσσου προειρημένα· προμεμελετημένα μοι ἢ ἀπόρρητα. Wunder, Nauck, Wecklein (Ars Soph. emend., p. 132), Ellendt, Blaydes and others reject the verse as spurious. Trach. 1159 πρόφαντον (ἦν). Schol. προμεμαντευμένον, προειρημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸς· οὕτω δὲ διὰ τοῦ σ ἐν τῇ τραγικῇ λέξει. Trach. 1163 πρόφαντον (τὸ θεῖον). Fg. 1021 πτερωτὰ φύλα. O. C. 1460 πτερωτὸς . . . βροντῇ. O. C. 1093 πυκνοστίκτω· . . ἑλάφον. Ant. 160 σύγκλητον . . . λέσχην. Schol. σύγκλητον λέσχην τὴν συγκληθεῖσαν ἐξαίφνης ὁμίλιαν ἐπειδὴ περ μεταπεμφάμενος τοὺς ἐντίμους εἰς ἐκκλησίαν συνήγαγεν. Cf. Eustath., p. 732, 53. El. 568 στικτὸν . . . ἔλαφον. Phil. 184 στικτῶν . . . θηρῶν. Phil. 33 στιπτὴ γε φυλλὰς. V. L. στειπτῇ. Trach. 916 στρωτὰ . . . φάρη. Ai. 65 συνδέτους (οἴκους). Ai. 296 συνδέτους . . . ταύρους. O. R. 733 σχιστὴ δ' ὁδός. El. 747 τμητοῖς ἱμάσι. El. 863 τμητοῖς ὀλκοῖς. Evidently the verbal is passive; but what does ὀλκοῖς mean? Schol. τμητοῖς δὲ ὀλκοῖς τοῖς ἱμάσιν· ὀλκοῖς οὖν ἀντὶ τῶν ἱμάντων ἐν οἷς εἰλκύσθη· τμητοῖς λώροις. Suidas, speaking of this passage, explains thus: τουτέστι τοῖς λώροις, τοῖς ἱμάσιν· ὀλκοῖς οὖν ἀντὶ τῶν ἱμάντων, οἷς εἰλκύσθη Ὀρέστης πεσὼν ἐκ τοῦ ἄρματος. Musgrave cannot believe that ὀλκοῖς was used for λώροις, and hence resorts to conjectures; while Hermann exclaims "Non video, quid impediatur simplicius (i. e. than the explanation of the Schol.) sulcos intelligi rotis arenae impressos." Ant. 858 τριπόλιστον οἶτον. On this difficult passage see the notes of Wex and Hermann. At one time Hermann wrote τρίπολιστον, which word does not exist. Böckh (p. 259) happily follows Schneider in deriving the verbal from πολίζω = πολέω, comparing Pindar's use of ἀναπολίζω (Pyth. VI 3) = ἀναπολέω, thus making τριπόλιστος = τριπόλητος. The verbal means, then, 'thrice (= oftentimes) revolved,' 'dreimal gepflügt, immer wiederholt' (Wecklein, Ausgewählte Tragödien des S., 1874): 'dreimal d. h. vielfach immer von neuem durchgesprochen' (Wolff-Bellermann ad loc.); similarly Jebb, Juris, Jasper, Linwood, Campbell. Schol. πολλάκις ἀναπεπολημένον ἢ διάσημον καὶ παν-

ταχοῦ ἀκούμενον καὶ πολούμενον· ἡ τὸν πολλάκις ἐπελθόντα τῷ ἐμῷ οἴκῳ ἡ γένει. We need not, then, with Hartung reject the word entirely, nor do we follow Donaldson's suggestion (*The New Cratylus*², p. 281): "For the form πολύς admits of an adverb in -*is* . . . and perhaps, after all, the difficult word τριπόλιστος in Soph., *Antig.* 857, may contain a remnant of this other superlative of πολύς." *Ant.* 848 τυμβόχωστον (ἔρμα). Donaldson (*The New Cratylus*², p. 494) classes this adjective amongst those Karmadhârya in which, exceptionally, the adjective does not precede the substantive, in the compound. 'In tumuli modum congestus' is the meaning of the verbal. *Ai.* 481 ὑπόβλητον λόγον. *O. C.* 794 ὑπόβλητον στόμα. *Trach.* 1052 ὑφαντὸν ἀμφίβληστρον. *El.* 58 φλογιστὸν (δέμας). *Fg.* 316 χαλκηλάτοις ὅπλοισι. *Fg.* 347 χαλκηλάτους λέβητας. *Ant.* 945 χαλκοδέτοις αἰλαῖς. *El.* 485 χαλκόπλακτος . . . γένυς. Reading and interpretation of this passage have both been matters of lively discussion. Otto Jahn follows the one MS reading, χαλκόπλακτος: Wakefield, Erfurdt and others have resorted to conjectures. We think the case not so hopeless, although the ancients were embarrassed in attempting to explain it. Thus the Scholiast: ἡ χαλκόπλακτος γένυς ἡ ἐλοῦσα αὐτὸν ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴ τιμωρὸς ἦξει κατὰ τῶν δρασάντων, to which the younger scholiasts are said to have added ἡ ἀπὸ χαλκοῦ ἡλασμένη, σφυρήλατος. The question is whether χαλκόπλακτος can mean χαλκήλατος, for we reject the active explanation of the verbal as being quite out of the question. Kvičala, *Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Sophokles*, I (1864), p. 34, denies this most decidedly, "denn niemals ward πλήττειν in der Bedeutung 'hämmern, treiben' (für ελαύνειν) gebraucht." This proves only that Sophocles has here (as elsewhere countless times) used an old word in a new sense—one of the characteristics of the language of our poet: we therefore accept this explanation of the verbal. *Ai.* 219 χειροδαίκτη σφάγι'. *Schol.* θύματα ὑπὸ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ δαΐχθέντα. *O. R.* 901 χειρόδεικτα (τάδε). *Trach.* 924 χρυσήλατος . . . περονίς. *O. R.* 1268 χρυσηλάτους περόνας. *El.* 837 χρυσοδέτοις ἔρκεισι. The play on the two meanings of ἔρκος, here, has caused the *Schol.* to give the two explanations of it—'a chain' and 'a trick'—in his long note ad loc. It means both here, the latter as a general form of the former. *Fg.* 224 χρυσόδετον κέρας. *Fg.* 1019 χρυσοτεύκτων (θεῶν ἀγάλματ').

VOICE, PASSIVE: TIME, RELATIVELY PRESENT.

It is quite in keeping with the timelessness of the adjective, as such, that these verbals (which, though adjectives, have never lost all of their participial nature) can refer to a contemporaneous (relatively present) act. It is well known that in Latin many of these forms in *-tus* denote relatively present act. The more surprised are we, then, that commentators seem to have almost entirely overlooked this very evident force of the verbals in Greek. M., I, p. 69, cites *two* passages (both from Athenaeus) in which verbals in *-τος* are used with the force of the present passive participle! Of the adjectives which belong here, not a few have been explained *potentially*—the merely passive explanation, be it remarked, is in all such cases both more fitting to the situation than the potential, and also it is more *forcible*, just as ‘one who is praised’ is more forcible, because saying more, than ‘one who may, can, deserves to be praised.’ Others have, still less happily, been explained actively. In some cases it is quite unwise to insist on the difference between present completion and present duration—such cases forming the boundary-line between those adjectives of which we have just been speaking and those to which we now turn our attention.

The contemporaneous duration (continued act in relatively present time) is seen most plainly in those ‘geographically present’ adjectives—for so we may call them—such as ‘the *sea-surrounded* isle,’ ‘an *uninhabited locality*,’ etc. Such are partly simplicia, partly syntheta, partly parasyntheta. Of the other cases a few are joined with persons—an innovation, as compared with Aischylos, who never admits this force of the verbals when joined with persons. This liberty is at first used cautiously, and some of the cases hesitatingly put here should, possibly, be otherwise explained. Aischylos used this force of the verbals more freely than Sophocles: in both authors syntheta and parasyntheta are more frequent than simplicia.

a) ‘Geographically Present.’

Ai. 1219 ἀλίκλυστον (πρόβλημα). Ai. 597 ἀλίπλακτος εὐδαίμων. The Laurentianus reads ἀλίπλαγκτος, which form Lobeck tells us certain Greek grammarians affirm *can* be used instead of ἀλίπλακτος. And yet we follow the tradition of certain more recent MSS, ἀλίπλακτος ‘quod unum verum est’ (Moritz, Seyffert, ad loc.)

Ellendt cites a late scholiast: ἀλίπλακτος· ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀλίκλυστος· ἀλίπλακτος ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀλιπλάκτως, ἥγουν ἐν θαλάσῃ ἀτακτοῦσῃ περὶ σέ. Trach. 752 ἀμφίκλυστος (ἀκτῇ). Trach. 780 ἀμφίκλυστον . . . πέτρῃ. Schol. τὴν κλυζομένην. Ai. 134 ἀμφιρύτου Σαλαμίνος. Phil. 2 ἄστιπτος (ἀκτῇ). V. L. ἄστειπτος. But it is quite out of our power to determine whether—to the Greek ear—the expression meant a shore ‘which *is* never trodden’ or ‘which *has* never yet been trodden,’ and hence the various definitions given in Stephanus. O. C. 28 οἰκητός (sc. τόπος). Phil. 1 περιρρύτου χθονός. Phil. 239 περιρρύτου Σκύρου.

β) *Other Examples.*

Ant. 881 ἀδάκρυτον (πότμον). The scholiast—whom, unhappily, Bloomfield (Gloss. Aischyl. Prom. 905) follows—is misled by the alpha, which he takes to be an intensivum, translating πολυδάκρυτον; cf. Triclinius, ad loc., Clemm, de alpha intensivo, p. 72 (No. 12), Hermann ad loc. Ai. 407 δίπαλτος (στρατός) ἃν με χειρὶ φονεύει. Schol. (and similarly Suidas) ἀμφοτέραις ταῖς χερσὶν οἷον περιδεξίως με φονεύει· παντὶ σθένει ὡς Δίδυμος· ἢ ὁ στρατός με φονεύει λαβὼν τὰ δίπαλτα δοράτια ὡς Πίος φησιν: to which Lobeck exclaims “Utinam de difficilioribus locis illorum apposuissem sententias.” Now Eustathius says (p. 674, 14) καὶ παλτὸν εἶδος τι ὄπλου, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ὁ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ δίπαλτος φονεύς (sic), thus making the word a *possessivum*; similarly Hermann, “δίπαλτος, proprie *duas hastas vibrans*, ἔχων δύο δοῦρε”: followed by Campbell, and similarly Holtze, p. 11. It is not to be denied that, taken as a *possessivum*, the adjective corresponds to the definitions of Pius and Didymus. Ellendt, speaking of these definitions of Pius and Didymus, says “mihi neutrum horum, sed a duobus Atridis *duplex* eorum exercitus dici videtur adsignificato impetu in παλτός, ut δικρατεῖς Ἀτρεΐδαι *duo* sunt, sed *reges* esse adsignificatur.” Again, Schambach, II, p. 14, argues, “Si omnino, quid Graecus poeta a suis popularibus intellegi voluerit, nobis licet coniectura assequi, haec mihi videtur illius locutionis sententia esse: *exercitus duobus ducibus* (Agamemnone et Menelao) *impetum faciens*. Activum πάλλειν pro medio πάλλεσθαι (intransitive) ab Euripide usurpatum esse docet Seidler. ad Eur. El. 433.” Schindler, p. 24, observes “δίπαλτος is est exercitus qui duplicata, h. e. summa vi ‘παντὶ σθένει,’ in Aiace cooritur”: similarly Schmidt, p. 52, note 22. Finally Slameczka, p. 12, classes it amongst those cases “wo das Epitheton aus zwei Teilen besteht, deren erster nicht den zweiten näher bestimmt,

sondern seiner Bedeutung nach für sich zum Substantiv attributivisch hinzutritt." The subject of the verb in the verbal is *στρατός*: this granted, the verbal is *passive*, and we follow Pape, "das doppelt angetriebene Heer, mit Rücksicht auf die beiden Atriden, welche das Heer wie ein Geschoss auf den Aias schleudern": for surely we will not explain it *actively* (!) with Linwood, Wolff and some others; cf. Mehlhorn, *Anac.*, p. 242. Apart from the fact that verbals in *-τος* are *very* rarely used in an active sense, *δίπαλτος* is *always*, as it seems, used as a passive. O. R. 864 *εὔσεπτον ἀγνείαν*. Jebb—doing violence to the evident meaning of the passage—makes this the only case in all Greek in which *εὔσεπτος* is used in an *active* sense. O. C. 1235 *κατάμειπτον . . . πύματον*. O. R. 173 *κλυτὰς χθονός*. With Ritter and Kvičala (*Beiträge*, IV, p. 88), we do not resort to conjectures to take the place of this simple epithet of Boeotia. *κλυτός* is one of those adjectives which stand on the boundary between the mere passivity and the modality, and hence it easily reflects whatever coloring the context may give it. With Buttmann (*Lexilogus*), Brugmann (*Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik*, II, p. 208) and others, we accept as the original meaning of *κλυτός* 'einer, von dem viel *gerühmt . . . gehört wird*,' hence merely passive, and indefinitely present. Ai. 177 *κλυτῶν ἐνάρων*. Ai. 375 *κλυτοῖς . . . αἰπολίοις*. Whether the adjective mean 'celebrated' or 'bleating' it is passive. El. 714 *κροτητῶν ἀρμάτων*. Clearly this means 'of rattling wagons' (*κροτέω* = 'to make to rattle'). Fg. 221 *κροτητὰ . . . μέλη*. Enallage for *κροτητῶν πεηκτίδων μέλη*. El. 1085 *πάγκλαυτον αἰῶνα*. O. C. 1440 *προϋπτον Ἀιδην*. El. 49 *τροχηλάτων δίφρων*.

γ) *With Persons.*

Trach. 854 *ἀγακλειτὸν (κέλωρα)*. Reading and sense of the passage are uncertain. We have accepted Dindorf's conjecture, *Ζηρὸς κέλωρ' ἀγακλειτὸν*; L. *ἀγακλειτὸν ἥρακλέους*. O. R. 762 *ἄποπτος (εἶη)*. Lobeck (*Ajax*, vs. 16), Hermann (*Aj.*, vs. 16), Schambach (II, p. 7), Ritter (*ad loc.*) and others have proved that the adjective means 'distant,' i. e. seen afar off. Its time is indefinitely present. Ai. 15 *ἄποπτος ἦς*. Suidas *πόρρωθεν ὁρώμενον* is more accurate than the scholiast's *δύρατος*. El. 1489 *ἄποπτον* (of the speaker himself). O. R. 1345 *καταρατότατον*. The adjective really qualifies the *με* of verse 1340.

ON THE MODALITY OF THE VERBALS.

We now turn to those verbals whose time is future. This seemingly strange use is most easily, though mechanically, explained by *prolepsis*, and it seems originally to have been regularly attended by a negative; cf. Brugmann, *Grundriss*, II, p. 207, and *Griech. Gramm.*² (in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*), p. 97. The transition in the meaning of the verbal, from that which *is* to that which *may be*, is very old, as we can trace it back into pre-Hellenic times; but the Greek language developed an especial inclination toward this modal use. The Latin example usually taken is *invictus*, which originally meant nothing more than 'not yet conquered' or (by *prolepsis*) 'so as to be unconquered,' and the transition in meaning from what will remain unconquered to unconquerable is a light one. That the adjective could not, save by *prolepsis*, denote *what WILL not be conquered* does not surprise us, when we remember how closely futurity and modality (potentiality) were connected in the classic languages, especially in Greek. We see, also, how the presence of the negative was particularly favorable to the development of this modality, as introducing a condition which *has never yet entered* or, by *prolepsis*, *so as that it will never enter or have entered*—and hence the inference that it *cannot enter*. But later the negative could be dispensed with, and indeed in Sophocles the number of *composita* with alpha *privativum* is quite below that of other *composita* and *simplicia*, the numbers being something like 40 to 90, of which latter number, however, a negative is more or less closely connected with the verbal in some 20 cases. Already Homer, who uses the verbals also modally, did not confine himself to a use of the adjective with a negative. Cf. Curtius, *Das Verbum*², II, p. 388. And yet the modal use of the verbals is, as mentioned above, never met with in the Attic inscriptions. One is almost tempted to think this must be a mere chance, the modality being quite usual from the oldest times on. In fact so abundant are examples of this use of the verbal that Kopetsch makes the number of potential verbals in Plato larger than that of merely passive ones (p. 13).

As illustrating the manner in which the modality arose from mere passivity, might be cited the following passages, which thus form the connecting link between those adjectives which were being considered in the last chapter and those to which our attention is now turned.

Ai. 450 ἀδάματος θεὰ. Schol. παρθένος, ἄζυγος. On the form ἀδάματος vs. ἀδάματος cf. Lobeck ad loc.; Elmsley, O. R. 196; Reisig, O. C. 1564. El. 1239 ἀδμήταν (*Ἀρτεμιν). The reading is uncertain; with Otto Jahn, Schütz and others, we retain the ἀδμήταν of the Laurentianus. O. C. 1321 ἀδμήτης . . . μητρός. O. C. 1572 ἀδάματον φύλακα.

Approaching the verbals more closely, we cite M., I, p. 32; here, under the heading 'de significatu potentiali et passivo simplicium et parasynthetorum,' the following law is laid down: "Illis, quae a verbis sub sensus cadentia aut ab iis orta significantibus repetita sunt, potestas passiva, iis autem, quae a verbis animi motus et agitationes exprimentibus sunt derivata, vis potentialis devincta est." On page 65, however, the author is himself compelled to add "inveniuntur utique exempla quoque, quae legibus prorsus sunt contraria, sed haec traducenda sunt ad licentiam libertatemque linguae, unde emanavit notum illud ac tritum: *nulla regula sine exceptione*." Now, to sustain this rule of his, Moissiszig cites some 150 simplicia and 108 parasyntheta, selected from writers in prose and poetry at random, which conform to the law: scarcely 30 adjectives seem to be 'exceptions.'

We object to this method of treating the subject because of its impracticability. It is almost impossible to draw the line, with accuracy, between verbs of the senses and those expressing emotions of the mind, especially when the one class is used metaphorically. Apart from this, how are we to classify forms like *διαλυτός* as against *διάλυτος*? Sophocles uses something like 8 parasyntheta, 26 simplicia and 50 syntheta modally: modal simplicia which are evident exceptions to M.'s rule are e. g. *θεαρός*, *ἀκουστός*, *ἀλωτός*, *λεκτός*, *ρήτός*, *βλεπτός*, *οἰκητός*. Furthermore, are we to believe really, then, that Greek verbs of emotion could never be used as mere passives? Without making a further point of it, then, we do not accept Moissiszig's clever suggestion, preferring to classify the examples of modal verbals according to the *cause*, *occasion* of this modality.

But Moissiszig (I, p. 70 f.) says—speaking de synthetorum potestatibus—that those "a nominibus composita duabus modo insignita sunt significationibus, passiva atque activa, quarum illa est frequentior"; this statement is sustained for Sophocles by the facts of the language. Of those derived from a privativum M. says: "Adiectiva ab hoc particula loquelari ordientia prolixè fluunt . . . significationes utique primariae sunt potentialis et

passiva, quarum usus par est" (but not in Sophocles, where the passives outnumber the thirty-odd cases of modal compounds with *a* priv.) "ita quidem, ut discrimina inveniri prorsus nequeant, quibus eveniat, ut aliquot alterutro, multa autem utroque praedita sint significatu, ut ἄθικτος intactus et intactilis, ἀελπτος insperatus et insperabilis, ἀτρωτος inviolatus et inviolabilis, ἀθαπτος autem ἀκλητος passivam, et ἀνήμετος ἀτλητος similia potentialem solam nacta sint vim." These statements are, in the main, supported by Sophocles' use of the language. But again: "A particula inseparabili *δυσ* coniugata solam prae se ferunt potestatem potentialem, ut: *δυσθέατος*, *δύσλυτος*, *δυσίατος* et sexcenta eiusdem generis. Duo modo invenimus exempla, quae activo praedita sunt significatu: *δυσάλητος*, Soph. O. tyr. 12, qui non facile dolores sentit i. e. durus, torpeus: et *δυσβάυκτος*, Aesch. Pers. 575, valde lamentans. Significatio horum adiectivorum passiva a linguae indole ac natura prorsus abhorret." But other exceptions to this rule are e. g. *δυσθρήνητος*, Ant. 1211; *δυσούριστος*, O. R. 1315; *δυσάλητος*, O. R. 12, Fg. 867; *δυσπότητος*, O. C. 1613. Finally, "Adiectiva, quorum pars prior particula est *εὔ*, activam, passivam, potentialem nauciscuntur intellectum." At first it seems strange that *δυσ*- and *εὔ*-compounds should be so dissimilar; but *εὔ*-compounds in Homer never (except once?) mean 'easy-, easily-,,' but only 'well-, beautifully-,,' the adjective being thus always passive, and K. Grashof (Über das Fuhrwerk, p. 8, note 8) maintains that Homer considers all composita with *εὔ* to be real *syntheta*, not paratheta, and hence uses them as adjectives of *two* endings. (This view is opposed by Hentze, Anhang zu Homers Ilias, E, vs. 466.) Kopetsch (p. 10) makes the following statement: "Coniugata autem sunt significationis potentialis adiectiva cum duobus praepositionibus, quae vocantur insuperabiles, alpha privativo et *δυσ*- et cum adverbio *εὔ*, *nunquam cum ullo nomine*." But in Aischylos not a few exceptions to this sweeping assertion have been found: similarly in Sophocles such forms as *ἀπόπτυστος*, *ἐμπληκτος*, *ἀνασχετός*, *ἀπώμοτος*, *ἐξάγιστος*, etc.

The verbal adjectives, when modal, vary in meaning all the way from that which is merely *physically* or *naturally* possible—through that which is because of innate higher qualities intentionally so—and through that which poetic exaggeration makes (im)possible—up to that which is *morally* (im)possible, extreme cases of which latter coloring certain ones have thought to be equivalent to the gerundive force of the verbals in *-τέος*. It is

impossible to decide in each case just where one of these forces merges into the other, but if a scheme of these shades of meaning dare be attempted, it might possibly be not unlike the following:

I. Really, physically (im)possible: α) *by nature* or *chance*, e. g. ἀναρίθμητος χρόνος. β) *intentionally* so: 'dignus qui,' e. g. ἄτεγκτος . . . φανεί.

II. Through *poetic exaggeration* or freedom of speech characterized as (im)possible; e. g. ἀνικήτων ὅπλων.

III. From *modesty*, *shame* or some *moral consideration* rendered (im)possible; e. g. ἄρρητον ἔπος.

(IV. That which *must* be?).

The ground, then, of this possibility rests on—a) what is *inherent in the nature of the subject* (whether intentionally or unintentionally); β) some *moral consideration*. Hence we distinguish I, the *first modality*, embracing I and II; II, the *second modality*, embracing III and (IV?). Our first modality is far more widely represented than the second, and is more usually connected with things than with persons, some 100 cases occurring with things, against less than 50 with persons. Of the second modality we have only about 20 examples, none of which are used with persons. The majority of these modally-used verbals occur in iambic verses.

EXAMPLES OF THE 'FIRST MODALITY.'

I. *With a priv.* α) *With Persons.*

Ai. 190 ἀσώτου . . . γενεᾶς. The verse is not (as Merkel will have it) corrupt, the subject being easily supplied from the preceding βασιλῆς. Schol. τῆς ἐξώλους καὶ σφῆσσαι μὴ δυναμένης. O. R. 336 ἄτεγκτος . . . φανεί; Schol. ἄτεγκτος δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀσυμπαθῆς καὶ ἀδάκρυτος: similarly Suidas, An. Bekk., p. 458, 11, and p. 218, 22. Ritter maintains that the verse is spurious because it destroys the *stichomythia*, and especially because of the strange use of ἀτελείητος. O. R. 792 ἄτλητον (γένος). Schol. τὸ μὴ δυνάμενον ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων ὁρᾶσθαι. El. 1388 ἄφυκτοι κύνες. With Hermann, Wunder, Nauck and others, we accept the latter explanation of the schol.: ἄς οὐκ ἔστι φυγεῖν.

β) *With Things.*

O. R. 1314 ἄφατον, ἀδάματόν τε (νέφος). V. L. ἀδάμαστον. Schol. ἄφατον, ἀφάτως ἐπεληλυθός . . . ἀδάμαστον δὲ ἀνιάτον, ὃ οὐδεὶς

δαμάσαι δυνήσεται ἢ σκληρόν καὶ τραχὺ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀδάμαντος. O. R. 205 ἀδάματ' (βέλεα). Ai. 648 ἄελπτον οὐδέν. Trach. 999 ἀκήλητον . . . ἄνθος. El. 123 ἀκόρεστον οἰμωγάν. O. C. 1675 ἀλόγιστα παροίσομεν. The exact meaning of the passage is disputed. With Stephanus, Wunder, Nauck, we take the adjective to be modal. El. 230 ἄλυτα (τάδε). Schol. τὸ θρηνεῖν τὸν πατέρα ἄλντόν μοι ἔσται ὃ ἔστιν οὐδέποτε παύσομαι ἀλλ' αἰὲν ἐν τῷ θρηνεῖν ἔσομαι. Phil. 198 ἀμάχητα βέλη. Ai. 646 ἀναριθμητος χρόνος. Ai. 714 ἀναύδατον (οὐδέν). ἀναύδατον (later ἀναύδητον), Lobeck; ἀναύδητον, L.; ἀναύδακτον, Hesychius. Ai. 52 ἀνηκέστου χαρᾶς. El. 888 ἀνηκέστω πυρί; Bergk, Nauck, Wecklein (Ars Soph. emend., p. 50) conjecture ἀνηφαίστω, which we, with Schütz, l. l., p. 304, reject 'aufs entschiedenste.' Curiously enough, Wunder takes the verbal here, and in the passage just discussed, to be either purely passive or even active! Kvičala's position (cf. Beiträge, I, p. 61 f.), that the verbal is merely passive, would be the more inviting, if the *uniform* (modal) usage of the verbal were not against it; cf. M., I, p. 72. Phil. 186 ἀνήκεστα μεριμνήματ'. O. R. 98 ἀνήκεστον (μῖασμα). El. 1408 ἀνήκουστα (ἥκουσ'). Triclinius ἦτοι ἂ οὐ δύναται τις ἀκοῦν. El. 166 ἀνήνυτον οἶτον. Campbell's active translation 'accomplishing nothing' is plainly wrong. The verbal is modally passive; cf. Stephanus, 'quae perfici non possunt'; Anec. Bekk., p. 13, 26, ἀνήνυτος πόνος: ὁ πολλὺς καὶ ὃν οὐχ οἶόν τε διανύσαι. Suidas: τὸν ἀτελείωτον μόρον, ἢ Ἡλέκτρα φησί. Ant. 781 ἀνίκατε ("Ερωσ). O. C. 1515 ἀνικήτου (χειρὸς). Phil. 78 ἀνικήτων ὄπλων. Ai. 683 ἄπιστος . . . λιμήν. Ai. 255 ἄπλατος (αἶσ'). The adjective has been derived from πελάξω (Gross, II, p. 12), πελάω (so e. g. Ebeling and Seidler), or even from πλάω (Stephanus). We derive it from πελάω. Trach. 1093 ἄπλατον θρέμμα. Trach. 982 ἄπλετον (βάρος). Construction and punctuation of the words disputed. Contrary to Hermann's conception of the passage, we have taken βάρος as a nominative. But the etymology of the verbal is disputed, and Gross, II, p. 12, does not harmonize with Gross, I, p. 9! We follow Lobeck, Pathologiae Graeci Sermonis Elementa, I, p. 245, who, rejecting other etymologies, argues: "Probabilius Graecus ille, quem testatus sum, ex ἀπλητος factum putat, hoc autem a πλέω impleo derivatum": so Curtius, Et.⁵, p. 277; Clemm, de alpha intensivo, p. 81, No. 28. El. 1336 ἀπλήστου . . . βοῆς. Trach. 1030 ἀποτίβατος . . . νόσος. O. C. 489 ἄπυστα φωνῶν. Schol. ἀνήκουστα ἀντὶ ἡρέμα καὶ συντόμως. Ai. 576 ἄρρηκτον σάκος. O. R. 301 ἄρρητα (πάντα). O. R. 464 ἄρρητ' ἄρρήτων. "Das Unaus-

sprechliche des Unaussprechlichen," Ritter. Hermann, Brunck, Wunder, Nauck and others have adduced passages in abundance to defend the above expression. Trach. 961 ἄσπετόν τι θαῦμα. We do not derive the verbal from ἔπομαι, but, with Vaniček (Griechisch-lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, p. 995), Schmidt (Synonymik der griechischen Sprache, I, p. 10), Göbel (Lexilogus, I, pp. 87-88), from the root ΣΠΕ or ΣΕΠ 'to say.' Ai. 222 ἄτλατον (ἀγγελίαν). Ai. 788 ἀτρύτων (κακῶν). Schol. πολυτρύτων, which definition is rightly rejected by Clemm, de alpha intensivo, p. 88, No. 37. Trach. 694 ἄφραστον, ἀξύμβλητον (φάτω). O. C. 1463 ἄφατος (κύπος). Trach. 1057 ἀφράστῳ . . . πέδη. Schol. ἀπροσδοκῆτῳ, ἀνευνοήτῳ ἢ ἀλέκτῳ ἢ περὶ ἧς οὐκ ἔχει τις φράσασθαι τίς εἴη τὴν φύσιν: this latter is the preferable explanation. Trach. 265 ἄφυκτ' . . . βέλη. Phil. 105 ἀφύκτους (ιούς). Fg. 611 ἄφυκτά τε μήδεα.

II. With δυσ-. a) With Persons.

O. C. 1722 δυσάλωτος οὐδεὶς. Ai. 609 δυσθεράπευτος Αἴας.

β) With Things.

Trach. 959 δυσπαλλάκτοις ὀδύνας. El. 1385 δυσέριστον αἶμα φυσῶν Ἄρης. By a slight *traiectio epitheti* the adjective—really belonging to Ἄρης—is joined with αἶμα; so Juris (p. 11): "Vix aliter explicare licet nisi, qui difficile impugnatur, 'qui est insuperabilis' (sic!): de Marte ad res ab eo gestas transfertur." But simpler is the explanation suggested by Lueck (De comparationum et translationum usu Sophocleo, Pars II, Neumark, 1880, p. 5): "quamquam enim paullo insolentius hoc appositionis genus videtur, tamen haec ratio multo probabilior est quam coniecturae in hunc locum prolatae"—his device consists in simply placing a comma before αἶμα. Ai. 1004 δυσθέατον ὄμμα. Ant. 1284 δυσκάθαρος . . . λιμήν. Ant. 1346 δυσκόμιστος (πότμος). Trach. 949 δύσκριτ' (μέλεα). Schol. δυσκατάληπτά ἐστιν ἰσομέγεθῃ ὄντα. Ai. 40 δυσλόγιστον (τί). Trach. 683 δύσνιπτον . . . γραφήν. O. C. 1687 δύσοιστον . . . τροφάν; Enallage for βίον δυσόιστον κ. τ. λ. Phil. 508 δυσόιστων πόνων. O. C. 1277 δυσπρόοιστον . . . στόμα. O. C. 286 δυσπρόσοπτον (κάρα). V. L. δυσπρόσωπον. El. 460 δυσπρόσοπτ' ὀνείρατα. Fg. 839 δυσπάλαιστον . . . κακόν. So Nauck, for Stobaios' δυσπλαιστον. O. R. 109 δυστέκμαρτον (ἔχρος).

III. *Compounds of εὔ.* a) *With Persons.*

Ai. 704 εὐγνωστος ἐμοὶ ξυνείη διὰ παντὸς εὐφρων (ὁ Δάλιος). Schol. καὶ συνείη μοι εὐφρων, εὐγνωστος, φανερός ὢν καὶ δῆλος ὅτι φιλεῖ με, to which Lobeck thus observes: "Scholiastes Rom. primum et extremum nomen ita connexa censet ut significetur φανερός ὢν ὅτι εὐφρων ἐστὶ *favoris manifestus*; sed non persuadet. Postquam enim Panem praesultatorem invitaverat chorus, nihil magis consentaneum videtur quam ut Apollinis quoque, dei festivissimi, numen praesens ex propinquo venerari gestiat, communi persuasione, deos cultoribus suis φαίνεσθαι ἐναργεῖς." Evidently the adjective is decidedly flat when translated as a mere passive—'well known'! The chorus wishes that the god may appear in body, *so plainly that he can be easily recognized*: the verbal is therefore modal and proleptic.

β) *With Things.*

Ai. 151 εὐπιστα λέγει. La. εὐπειστα altered by another hand into εὐπιστα.

IV. *Remaining Examples.* a) *With Persons.*

O. C. 1383 ἀπόπτυστος (σὺ). Ai. 1358 ἐμπληκτοι (φῶτες). Schol. οἱ μὴ ἐμμένοντες τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ ἀρετῇ καὶ φιλίᾳ, ἄφρονες παρὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· ἄλλως: ἐμπληκτοι κοῦφοι, εὐμετάβλητοι. We accept the latter explanation of the schol. So Lobeck: "Ἐμπληκτος idem valet quod ἄστατος εὐμετάβολος, ut Hesychius et Eustathius, p. 1886, 40, interpretantur." 'Mutabilis,' Schambach (I, p. 43). Ant. 1161 ζηλωτός (Κρέων). Or is the verbal merely passive? "Ut ei invadere potuisses," M., I, p. 44. O. C. 1665 θαυμαστός (τις). Fg. 872 θαυμαστὰ. Ai. 915 θεατός (sc. Αἴας). El. 234 πιστά (μάτηρ). El. 1204 πιστὰς (πρὸς πιστὰς ἐρεῖς). El. 1352 πιστὸν (δὺν). O. R. 385 πιστὸς (Κρέων). O. R. 1118 πιστὸς (ἄλλος). O. C. 334 πιστῶ μόνῳ (οἰκετῶν). O. C. 356 πιστὴ (φύλαξ). O. C. 1322 πιστὸς . . . γόνος. O. C. 1395 πιστοῖσι συμμάχοισιν. Trach. 286 πιστὸς (ἐγὼ). Trach. 541 πιστὸς (Ἡρακλῆς). Phil. 1272 πιστός (of the person addressed). Fg. 303 πιστοὶ με κοχεύουσιν. Ai. 1369 χρηστός γ' ἔσει. "Χρηστὸν," defines Kopetsch, p. 21, "dignum, quo utare, h. e. utile vel omnino quod in genere suo est bonum." O. R. 610 χρηστοὺς (κακοὺς) νομίζειν . . . χρηστοὺς κακοὺς. O. C. 1014 χρηστός (ξείνος). O. C. 1430 χρηστοῦ (στρατηλάτου). Ant. 520 χρηστός (ὁ). Ant. 662 χρηστός (ἀνὴρ). Trach. 452 χρηστός (θέλης γενέσθαι). Phil. 437 χρηστοὺς (τούς).

β) *With Things.*

O. R. 1312 ἀκουστών (δαινόν). O. R. 111 ἀλωτόν (τὸ ζητούμενον). "Τὸ ληφθῆναι δυνάμενον," Suidas defines it, citing this passage. O. C. 1652 ἀνασχετοῦ (φόβου). Trach. 721 ἀνασχετόν (ζῆν). Phil. 987 ἀνασχετὰ (ταῦτα). O. R. 429 ἀνεκτὰ (ταῦτα). Ant. 282 ἀνεκτὰ (λέγεις). Ant. 388 ἀπώμοτον (οὐδέν). Schol. ἀπώμοτον ἀντὶ ἀπηγορευμένον καὶ ἀπροσδόκητον· ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐκ ὀφείλει τις ἀπομόσασθαι περὶ τινος ὅτι οὐκ ἂν αὐτὸ πράξειεν. O. R. 1337 βλέπτόν ἢ στερεκτόν (τί). O. C. 1526 ἐξάγιστα (ἄ). Schol. καθαρά· σημαίνει γὰρ καὶ τὸ ἄγος τοῦτο. οὕτως, ἐξάγιστα ἀντὶ ἀγνὰ καὶ μὴ οἷά τε ῥηθῆναι· καὶ ἐπὶ τούτου γὰρ χρώνται πολλαχοῦ. "Neque vero," argues Hermann, "probari posse puto, quod et scholiastae, et aliis interpretibus placet, ἐξάγιστα esse *valde sancta*, sed est illa vox pariter ut μηδὲ κινείται ad λόγῳ referenda: *quae piaculum est nec licet dicere*." The verbal means 'sins,' that is, 'what deserves to be accursed.' O. R. 361 γνωτόν (εἰπεῖν). γνωτόν, Elmsley; γνωστόν, L. If Merkel's reading (especially of the previous verse) is correct, the verbal means 'intelligible.' Fg. 731 διδακτὰ (τὰ μὲν) . . . εὐρετὰ (τὰ δέ). Trach. 699 εἰκαστόν ὥστε πρίονος ἐκβρώματ'. Phil. 191 θαυμαστόν (οὐδέν). But the verbal can, of course, be merely passive. O. C. 1360 κλαυτὰ δ' ἐστίν. V. L. κλαυστά. The verbal means 'worthy of being wept over,' not what *must* (is *necessary to be*) wept over—in which latter case it would be the only exception in Sophocles to the rule that verbals in -τος do *not* exhibit the signification of 'necessity.' Phil. 633-34 λεκτὰ (πάντα), πάντα δὲ τολμητά. O. C. 1036 μεμπτόν (οὐδέν). Phil. 1193 νεμεσητόν . . . θροεῖν. Schol. οὐκ ἔστι, φησί, μεμπτόν τῷ δυστυχοῦντι καὶ παραφθέγγεσθαι. Hesychius' definition of νεμεσητόν is μεμψίμοιρον, καὶ ὃ ἂν τις ἐντραπείη. O. C. 97 πιστόν . . . πτερόν. O. C. 626 πιστόν (τὸ σόν). O. C. 1488 πιστόν (τὸ). Trach. 398 πιστόν (τὸ). Phil. 71 πιστὴ (ὁμιλία). Fg. 601 πιστόν οὐδέν. Phil. 756 ῥητόν (sc. ἐπίσχυμα). Fg. 325 συγγνωστόν εἰπεῖν. Ai. 466 τλητόν (τοῦργον). Ai. 223 φευκτὰν (ἀγγελίαν). Phil. 1154 φοβητός (χῶρος). This is Hermann's text; οὐκέτι φοβητόσ, L. Ai. 468 χρηστόν (τι). El. 240 χρηστῷ (τῷ). The verbal is neuter, referring to a good *thing*, and the scholiast is wrong in referring it to some imaginary person. El. 972 χρηστὰ (τὰ). Ant. 299 χρηστὰς (φρένας). Ant. 636 χρηστὰς (γνώμας). Trach. 3 χρηστός (sc. αἶών). Trach. 231 χρηστὰ . . . ἔπη. Trach. 470 χρηστὰ (λεγοῦση). Trach. 1136 χρηστὰ μωμένη. Trach. 1137 χρήστ'. Phil. 450 χρηστὰ (τὰ). Phil. 457 χρηστὰ (τὰ). Phil. 476 χρηστόν (τὸ). Phil. 584 χρηστὰ (ἀντιπάσχω). Fg. 85 χρηστόν (ἅπαν τὸ). Some, however, interpret

the verbal as referring to a person; cf. Campbell's note. Fig. 736 *χρηστὰ (τὰ)*.

ON THE SECOND MODALITY.

Kopetsch (p. 22) cites only three adjectives in Plato which contain the notion of that which is 'nefas . . . patrare': these are *ἀκίνητος*, *ἀπόρρητος*, *ἄβατος*. In Sophocles, as in Aischylos, the number is much larger. The signification of 'necessity,' cf. verbals in *-τέος*, is nowhere in Sophocles to be met with in verbals in *-τος*. The very circumstance that Sophocles made freer use of the forms in *-τος* explains why he all the more avoided using those in *-τος* in a sense even approaching that of those in *-τέος*; compare O. C. 1360, where they are balanced against one another for the sake of greater contrast. The verbals thus used are all either simplicia—not infrequently with a negative—or syntheta. As above stated, this use of the adjectives is seen only when they are joined with names of *things*.

I. With a *priv.*

O. R. 891 *ἀθικτων* (τῶν). Schol. ὁ ἐστὶν ὃν οὐ χρὴ ἔχεσθαι. O. R. 897 *ἄθικτον* . . . ὀμφαλὸν. Schol. οὐκέτι ἄπειμι πρὸς τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα οὐδὲ πρὸς τὸν ἄχραντον καὶ ἀπροσπέλαστον αὐτοῦ νεών. Whether this ὀμφαλὸς was the temple itself or the white stone is disputed. O. C. 39 *ἄθικτος* (χωῖρος). Ant. 1060 *ἀκίνητα* . . . φράσαι. O. C. 624 *ἀκίνητ'* ἔπη. Ai. 773 *ἄρρητόν τ'* ἔπος.

The following three adjectives could very easily be referred to the first modality. Such cases mark the transition from the one modality to the other.

El. 203 *ἄρρητων* (δείπνων). Schol. ἃ οὐδὲ ὀνομάσαι καλόν. Ai. 214 *ἄρρητον* (λόγον). Schol. κακόφημον μὴδὲ λέγεσθαι ὀφείλοντα. O. C. 1001 *ἄρρητόν τ'* ἔπος.

II. Remaining Examples.

Trach. 64 *διδακτά*. Schol. εἰ προσήκει μοι μαθεῖν. Trach. 671 *διδακτόν*. Schol. εἰ μὴ ἀπόρρητον εἶη. O. R. 300 *διδακτά τε* ἄρρητά τ' κ. τ. λ. O. C. 39 *οἰκητὸς* (χωῖρος). Ant. 874 *παραβατόν* (κράτος). O. R. 993 *ρήτόν;* (sc. μάντευμα). O. R. 1289 *ρήτά μοι*. O. C. 1001 *ρήτόν* . . . ἔπος.

CHARLES EDWARD BISHOP.